

U.S.-Middle East Interaction

To the Editor:

It sometimes appears as if the Israeli leaders, elated by their stunning victory, were living in a dream world—where everything can be settled exactly as they wish, regardless what other people think, say or do.

They gave us an excellent lesson in how to wage a war if it is to be waged at all—decisively, forcefully and fast, not in slow and hesitant steps as it has been the case in Vietnam and partly even in Korea. At present, they are offering us an example how to squander the most precious fruit of victory, fruit that can never consist in conquest but only in lasting peace.

In spite of frequent warnings by their best friends in England and in the States, they reject with contempt peace offers which they would have accepted with joy not more than four years ago.

They claim safe, geographically defensible borders, and at the same time they insist on creating a strategist's nightmare, a 100 miles-long corridor deep into Arab lands and waters.

They want to occupy permanently vast tracts of foreign territory and expect the Arabs and the rest of the world to call it peace.

Confident in their military superiority and in an endless flow of American arms and money, they seem to prefer living on a powder keg rather than to accept much lesser risks inherent in every peace agreement.

Unless a more realistic attitude prevails, Israel will have to resume unavoidably the fateful proverbial march from victory to victory towards a possible final defeat. And the resulting holocaust may engulf the States as well.

B. NAGORSKI

New York, April 14, 1971

To the Editor:

It is irritating to see ex-C.I.A. man Miles Copeland repeat [Op-Ed April 16] the silly old charge that Washington's Middle East policy is made in Tel Aviv. To dispose of this quickly, he calls the "frightening" Soviet military buildup in Egypt and growing presence in the Mediterranean the result, not the cause, of U.S. aid and comfort to Israel. That is nonsense: Egypt's aggressive tactics precipitated the Six Day War in 1967; the U.S. tried to play peacemaker and failed; it helped neither side in the war.

When Israel won, the Soviets began their military buildup. It is true that over two decades the U.S. has supplied arms and economic aid to Israel. It is also true that the U.S. is extending such aid to Jordan, and at one time or another has done the same for all the Arab countries. Where it no longer obtains, it is because of the Arabs opting out and choosing other "patrons."

Mr. Copeland complains: "Whatever the ultimate effect on purely American interests, we are behind the Israelis 100 per cent." If that is the case, how does he explain the failure of the U.S. to aid Israel in any of the three wars since 1947? In the recent truce negotiations, U.S. diplomats proved their "enslavement" to Tel Aviv in a strange way: They vehemently denied Israeli charges that the Egyptians had violated the truce by moving missiles into the Suez Canal Zone. Six weeks later, they sheepishly admitted that the Israeli charges were correct. This doesn't speak well for either the "intelligence" or the intelligence of our State Dept. and C.I.A., but it certainly eliminates Mr. Copeland's argument.

JOSEPH ASHER

New York, April 16, 1971